

REMARKS

Claim 15 was rejected as being indefinite on the grounds that the limitation as to range of light directed upwardly is unclear as to whether it refers to total light or from that of end fluorescent bulbs. As explained in page 9, end of penultimate paragraph, the percentage refers to total light and claim 15 has been amended accordingly.

Claim 16 was rejected as being anticipated by US Patent Number 6,210,018 of Kassay, cited by applicant. This claim has been amended to depend from Claim 1. In Kassay '018 the lamps are wrapped by reflectors, allowing only down light and no percentage of up light. The angle and the reflector design are only to give maximum efficient of light toward the floor and maximum spread at the floor, there is no up light component. In contrast, in the present invention as noted in Claim 16, a reflector system creates up light and a reflector edge detail allows for a controlled amount of uplight.

Claims 1-15 were rejected as being unpatentable over McAlpin 6,428,183 over Baumgartner 2,619,583.

McAlpin discloses a conventional fluorescent light fixture with oblique and end walls with no provision based upon configuration of the oblique walls for directing a portion of light upwardly.

Baumgartner has a fluorescent fixture with an end reflector 72 spaced from the outer edge of a vertical wall to direct a portion of the light upwardly. According to the Examiner, it would be obvious to add such a reflector to the teachings of McAlpin. As seen in Fig. 8, end reflector 72 has a convex surface facing the end light bulb, just opposite the configuration of the present invention as will be pointed out below.

In the present invention, some light is directly upwardly by foreshortening the oblique walls as is illustrated in Figs. 1 and 6-10 and having a spaced end reflector with a concave surface facing the bulb under each end reflector (see Fig. 5A), a feature not suggested in either of the above references.

(Baumgartner's spaced reflector 72 has a convex surface facing the end bulb as noted above.) Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to recite this feature.

Contrary to McAlpin, in the present invention, the lamps are housed under the center of the fixture vertically and within the fixtures outermost edges/borders. The up light is created by the reflectors controlling the light and reflecting it upward. McAlpin, on the other hand, has auxiliary lamps 32 and 33 above the fixture, which the present invention does not. McAlpin is subject to massive dirt depreciation to the light output of the up light

component, which the present invention is not, as all lamps are protected within and under the outmost borders of the fixture.

Concerning Claim 5, in the present invention, the reflector ends higher than bottom edge of the fixture to allow for the up light component with lamps all beneath and protected within the outermost edges/borders of the fixture. McAlpin does not achieve this.

With respect to Claim 6, McAlpin does not allow any up light from the lamps under and within the bordering edges of the fixture, as in the present invention.

Concerning Claim 7, McAlpin has no up light lens above lamps and reflector to protect lamps that create up light in the lower section of the fixture from dirt accumulation and dirt lumen output depreciation..

As for Claim 11, the pendant bracket creates a stabilized hanging system, not just a suspension system. This is separate from the other claims and has no mention in McAlpin. This creates a three point stabilizing system at the fixture from one point of attachment at the ceiling.

With respect to Claim 13, it has been amended to describe a fluorescent light fixture in which each said adjacent oblique wall and each said concave section includes means to allow some light from the light bulb under said end reflector to be directed

upwardly from lamps that are located under and with the outermost edges/borders of the fixture.

Claim 14 is different than McAlpin, which describes a light fixture with just added lamps to the top of the fixture, with no regard to protecting the lamps from damage and dirt depreciation or ease of replacement from below. The present invention is a new, different approach to up lighting that addresses maintenance, protection of the lamps and dirt depreciation criteria.

The remaining depending claims all add details of the invention and should be allowed along with their parent claim 1.

New Claim 17 is directed toward the embodiment illustrated in Fig. 5B in which an end reflector has an outer edge with a concave surface facing an end bulb. This feature is not taught or suggested in any of the above references.

Applicant has a novel and improved apparatus for providing indirect lighting from a fluorescent fixture not shown or suggested by any of the references discussed by the Examiner. The claims in their amended form are believed to be drawn to the novel and unobvious features of the present invention.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned if further changes are required to obtain allowance of the application.

A favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Alfred Walker
ALFRED M. WALKER
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 29, 983
225 Old Country Road
Melville, NY 11747-2712
631-361-8737

Dated: February 28, 2006

Certificate of Fax Transmission

I certify that the foregoing Amendment is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO (571)273-8300 on the date indicated below.

February 28, 2006

Alfred Walker
Alfred Walker